REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 12-14, and 17 remain pending, with Claims 1, 8, and 17 being independent. Claims 1, 8, and 17 have been amended. Claims 15, 16, and 18 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Support for the claim amendments throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Thus, Applicant submits no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 8, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,575 (Keiller) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,865,536 (Jochumson), U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,615 (Kirby et al.), and U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,654 (Brown et al.). Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keiller in view of Jochumson, Kirby et al., and Brown et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,121 (Crepy et al.). Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Keiller in view of Jochumson, Kirby et al., and Brown et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,613 (Baker).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejections and solely to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 to clarify features of the invention. Applicant submits the claims are patentable over the cited reference, for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action of July 12, 2007, cites Keiller as allegedly disclosing an apparatus, method, and system for recording speech comprising, *inter alia*, recording means for recording

input speech as learning data for recognizing speech when it is determined that a matching rate between the input speech and the recorded speech exceeds a predetermined level.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Keiller fails to teach or suggest relating input speech to a recording character string. Instead, Keiller discloses merely checking the consistency between two recorded training examples. See Keiller, col. 15, lines 28-31. Keiller does not relate the recorded training examples to a separate recording character string. Thus, Keiller cannot be understood to teach or suggest "recording means relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed by [a] display control means and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 1, "a recording step of relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed in [a] display control step and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 8, or "a forth program code unit for relating the input speech itself to [a] displayed recording character string and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 17.

Applicant further submits the secondary citations to Jochumson, Kirby et al., and Brown et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Keiller.

Jochumson is cited in the Office Action as allegedly disclosing a speech correction device comprising presentation means for presenting an unmatched portion between a recognized character string pattern that a user has verbalized and an expected recording string pattern.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Jochumson discloses providing feedback to a user after comparing verbalized speech to word or phrase Jochumson, col. 2, lines 59-65. Jochumson does not disclose the recording of speech in a database in conjunction with the comparison. Thus, as in case of Keiller, Jochumson cannot be understood to teach or suggest

"recording means relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed by [a] display control means and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 1, "a recording step of relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed in [a] display control step and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 8, or "a forth program code unit for relating the input speech itself to [a] displayed recording character string and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 17.

Kirby et al. is cited in the Office Action as allegedly disclosing a speech recognition device that comprises a display control means for controlling the display of a recording character string indicating a sentence to be recorded.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Kirby et al. does not teach or suggest recording speech into a database as recited in the claims of the present application. That is, Kirby et al. is not concerned with storing speech. Thus, Kirby et al., like Keiller and Jochumson, cannot be understood to teach or suggest "recording means relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed by [a] display control means and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 1, "a recording step of relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed in [a] display control step and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 8, or "a forth program code unit for relating the input speech itself to [a] displayed recording character string and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 17.

Brown et al. is cited in the Office Action as allegedly disclosing a speech synthesis apparatus comprising a re-input means for issuing an instruction to again input speech when it is determined by a determining means that a matching rate is not met.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Brown et al. merely discloses the re-inputting of speech for the purposes of attempting recognition of the speech. Brown et al., col. 3, lines 37-53. Brown does not disclose any sort of recording means, recording step, or programing code for recording. As such, Brown et al., like Keiller, Kirby et al., and Jochumson, cannot be understood to teach or suggest "recording means relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed by [a] display control means and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 1, "a recording step of relating the input speech itself to [a] recording character string displayed in [a] display control step and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 8, or "a forth program code unit for relating the input speech itself to [a] displayed recording character string and recording it into [a] database" as recited in independent Claim 17.

Applicant further submits the secondary citations to Crepy et al. and Baker do not cure the above-noted features of the other cited references. The Office Action cites Crepy et al. and Baker as allegedly suggesting certain features recited in the dependent claims of the present application. Even if Crepy et al. and Baker do suggest the features as asserted in the Office Action, Applicant still submits that neither of these references teach or suggest recording means, recording step, or programing code as recited in independent Claim 1, 8, and 17.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 are patentable over the cited references, whether the references are taken individually or in combination.

Dependent Claims 5-7 and 12-14 also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in

independent Claims 1 and 8. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicant also respectfully submits that all outstanding matters in this application have been addressed and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and passage to issue of the application are respectfully sought.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

_____

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1654826v1